

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claims 2-3, 6-9, and 13-15 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Title of the Invention was objected to as "being not descriptive." The Title been amended.

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities and has been amended to correct same.

The specification was objected to "as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter."

However, the objected-to phrases "information processing apparatus", "synchronization control data", "generation means", "counter value", "transmission means", "control data transmission means", "data transmission means", "transmission resetting means" are each recited in the Disclosure of the Invention (now Summary of the Invention). (See, e.g., pages 2-6 of the specification.) Further, each of these phrases is recited in the originally filed claims, which is also part of the disclosure of the application. (See M.P.E.P. § 608.01(1)..) Hence, support for each of these phrases is present in the disclosure of the application, and therefore the application clearly provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and have been amended to correct the informalities. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9-17 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being "directed to non-statutory subject matter." Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to more clearly show that the claims cover statutory subject matter.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Voth (U.S. Patent No. 6,299,169). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Voth.

Independent claims 1, 4-5, 10-12, and 16-17 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found, e.g., in Fig. 11 and on pages 25-27 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

transmission resetting means that resets said transmission clock counter immediately upon the transmission of the synchronization control data being complete[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Voth neither disclose nor suggest resetting a transmission clock counter. Moreover, the relied on sections of Voth neither disclose nor suggest resetting a transmission clock counter immediately upon transmission of synchronization control data being completed.

Rather, such sections of Voth merely describe a master node that calculates a time offset between a time clock in the master node and a time clock in the slave node, and if the time offset is non-zero, the master node sends an INFO message to the

slave node. (See Fig.6, col.6 ll.54-59, and col.7 ll.36-40.) The relied on sections of the reference are not at all concerned with resetting the time clock of the master node, and these sections are not at all concerned with resetting the time clock of the master node, immediately upon transmission of the INFO message being completed. Hence, the relied on sections of Voth do not disclose or suggest the features set out in the above excerpt of claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites:

reception resetting means that resets said reception clock counter immediately upon the receiving of the data being completed and the received data being determined to be the synchronization control data[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Voth neither disclose nor suggest resetting a reception clock counter immediately upon the receiving of data being completed, and the relied on sections of Voth neither disclose nor suggest resetting a reception clock counter immediately upon received data being determined to be synchronization control data.

Rather, such sections of Voth describe that the master node sends the INFO message to the slave node if the calculated time offset is non-zero, and the INFO message tells the slave node when to implement time changes and adjustments contained in the INFO message. (See col.7 ll.36-40 and 47-49.) Namely, the slave node implements the time changes and adjustments based on the content of the INFO message rather than implementing such changes based on the receiving of the INFO message being completed and when the INFO message being determined to be the INFO message. Moreover, because the INFO message is sent if the calculated time offset is non-zero, the slave node does not receive an INFO message indicating a zero time offset and therefore would not implement time changes and adjustments immediately upon the receiving of the INFO message being

completed. Thus, the relied on sections of Voth do not disclose or suggest the features set out in the above excerpt.

Also, for the reasons set out above, the relied on sections of Voth neither disclose nor suggest:

the resetting of the transmission clock counter of the first information processing apparatus and the resetting of the reception clock counter of the second information processing apparatus thereby being substantially concurrent.

(Emphasis added.)

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that the relied on sections of Voth do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 1 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Independent claims 4-5, 10-12, and 16-17 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Each of these claims is therefore patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Voth for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 6 depends from claim 5, and claim 13 depends from claim 12. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Voth at least for the same reasons as its parent claim.

As to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (i) claims 8 and 14 were rejected under as being unpatentable Voth in view of Zdepski (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,864), (ii) claims 9 and 15 were rejected under as being unpatentable Voth in view of Nuber (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,415), and (iii) claims 3 and 7 were rejected under as being unpatentable Voth in view of Salo (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,318). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 5, and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 12.

Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Voth at least for the same reasons as its parent claim.

Neither the relied-on sections of Zdepski, the relied-on sections of Nuber, nor the relied-on sections of Salo overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Voth.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102(b), 103(a), and 112, second paragraph.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

942931_1.DOC